



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/577,471

04/27/2006

Yuji Iwaki

0756-7673

4788

31780

7590

06/30/2010

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
3975 Fair Ridge Drive
Suite 20 North
Fairfax, VA 22033

EXAMINER

WILSON, MICHAEL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1786

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/577,471	Applicant(s) IWAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL WILSON	Art Unit 1786	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2010 and 13 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-21 and 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-21 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2010 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20091109 and 20100414</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed 14 April 2010, which amends claims 1-4, 8, 9, 13-16, 20, 21, and 27-29.

Claims 1-9, 13-21, and 25-29 are pending.

2. Applicants overcame the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kido et al. (US 2005/0084712 A1) in view of Shiratsuchi et al. (US 6,084,176) by amending the claims in the reply filed 14 April 2010.

3. Applicants overcame the rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kido et al. (US 2005/0084712 A1) in view of Shirota et al. (US 5,487,953) by amending the claims in the reply filed 14 April 2010.

4. The publication date of Ikeda et al. (WO 2005/031798 A2) lies between the filing date and the foreign priority date of the present application. Under MPEP 706.02(b), rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 102(a) can be overcome by perfecting the filing date of the priority document. Applicant's submission of certified priority document on 27 April 2006 and its English language translation on 13 May 2010 results in the perfection of the foreign priority filing date. Therefore, Ikeda et al. (WO 2005/031798 A2) is no longer properly applicable as prior art under 102(a) however the reference is applicable under 102(e). Applicants have further stated that Ikeda et al. (WO 2005/031798 A2) and the

Art Unit: 1786

presently claimed invention were commonly owned at the time the invention was made disqualifying the reference from a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(c).

5. The Examiner withdraws the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. (WO 2005/031798 A2) in view of Shiratsuchi et al. (US 6,084,176) because of Applicant's perfection of foreign priority and statement of common ownership excluding Ikeda et al. from a 103(a) rejection under 103(c).

6. The Examiner withdraws the rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. (WO 2005/031798 A2) in view of Shirota et al. (US 5,487,953) because of Applicant's perfection of foreign priority and statement of common ownership excluding Ikeda et al. from a 103(a) rejection under 103(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1786

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 2003/0218418 A9) in view of Seo et al. (US 2002/0086180 A1) and Shiratsuchi et al. (US 6,084,176).

Regarding claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 28, Sato et al. disclose a light-emitting element comprising a first and second electrode [0031], a light-emitting layer between the electrodes [0031], and a layer hole transporting layer [0172]. Additionally the reference discloses the hole transporting layer ensures high efficiency in hole injection from the anode and efficient transportation of hole to the light-emitting layer [0172]. Compounds such as 4,4'-bis[N-(1-naphthyl)-N-phenylamino]biphenyl, aromatic amine compounds having a star burst structure, and spiro compounds such as 2,2',7,7'-tetrakis(diphenylamino)-9,9'-spirobifluorene are disclosed as suitable for the hole transport layer. The reference also discloses metal oxides such as ruthenium oxide and molybdenum oxide as able to facilitate hole injection from the anode with high hole mobility ([0211]-[0212]). A layer of metal oxide on the anode is disclosed to lower initial driving voltage, suppress the voltage elevation on continuous driving, and improve adhesion [0211]. However the reference does not explicitly disclose a carbazole compound with a transition metal oxide in the hole transporting layer.

Seo et al. teach a similar organic electroluminescent device (abstract). The reference teaches combining the hole injection and transport layers into a single mixed

Art Unit: 1786

layer [0033]. By combining the layers the reference teaches an energy barrier can be reduced lowering drive voltage and increasing service life of the device ([0032]-[0034]).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the hole transport and injection layers, as taught by of Seo et al., in the device of Sato et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect such a layer to be suitable given that Seo et al. and Sato et al. both teach similar phosphorescent organic electroluminescent devices. Additionally Sato et al. teach that material used for the hole transporting layer needs a small ionization potential, high hole mobility, and excellent stability [0172], which are properties Sato et al. discloses metal oxides to have ([0211]-[0212]). Ruthenium oxide and molybdenum oxide are also disclosed to efficiently inject holes from the anode and transport the holes to subsequent layers, which is disclosed as the function of the hole transport layer [0172]. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that *adding* oxides of ruthenium or molybdenum to the hole transport layer would not destroy the function of the layer given that Sato et al. clearly discloses the metal oxides to possess properties desirable for the hole transport layer. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by a desire to improve adhesion (Sato et al. [0211]), lower the drive voltage, suppress the voltage elevation on continuous driving, and increase the service life of the device.

Shiratsuchi et al. teach carbazole compounds of instant general formulae (1), (2) with Ar of instant formula 2-1 (compound H-23, column 23), and (3) (compound H-38 column 29) with instant Ar 3-1 (compounds H-24, column 23) and as suitable compounds for the hole transport layer (column 13, line 12 to column 14, line 5) used in

Art Unit: 1786

a photoelectric device (column 2, lines 12-16). The reference also teaches carbazole compounds as equivalent with the hole transporting compounds of Sato et al. such as 4,4'-bis[N-(1-naphthyl)-N-phenylamino]biphenyl, aromatic amine compounds having a star burst structure, and tertiary amine containing fluorene compounds for use in the hole transport layer (column 13, line 12 to column 14, line 5).

In view of Shiratsuchi et al.'s recognition that carbazole compounds and hole transporting compounds of Sato et al. are equivalent and interchangeable, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the hole transporting compounds of Sato et al. with carbazole compounds such as H-23, H-24, or H-38 taught by Shiratsuchi et al. and thereby arrive at the present invention. Case law holds that the mere substitution of an equivalent (something equal in value or meaning, as taught by analogous prior art) is not an act of invention; where equivalency is known to the prior art, the substitution of one equivalent for another is not patentable. See *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Regarding claims 25 and 26, Sato et al. disclose all the claim limitations as set forth above. Additionally the reference discloses a means for controlling light emission of the light-emitting element given that the voltage needed to obtain a specific luminance is reported (table 3, page 46). Also the reference discloses an electronic appliance with a display portion comprised of a light emitting element [0261].

Regarding claim 27, modified Sato et al. disclose all the claim limitations as set forth above. Additionally the reference discloses the thickness of a hole transport layer to be between 10 and 100 nm, overlapping with the presently claimed range [0177].

Regarding claim 29 modified Sato et al. disclose all the claim limitations as set forth above. Additionally the claimed range encompasses a 1:1 mixture of the compounds. When faced with a mixture, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by common sense to select a 1:1 ratio, absent evidence of unexpected results. Case law holds that "[h]aving established that this knowledge was in the art, the examiner could then properly rely... on a conclusion of obviousness, 'from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art within any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.'" *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

10. Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, 25, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 2003/0218418 A9) in view of Seo et al. (US 2002/0086180 A1) and Shirota et al. (US 5,487,953).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, and 28, Sato et al. disclose a light-emitting element comprising a first and second electrode [0031], a light-emitting layer between the electrodes [0031], and a layer hole transporting layer [0172]. Additionally the reference discloses the hole transporting layer ensures high efficiency in hole injection from the anode and efficient transportation of hole to the light-emitting layer [0172]. Compounds such as 4,4'-bis[N-(1-naphthyl)-N-phenylamino]biphenyl, aromatic amine compounds having a star burst structure, and spiro compounds such as 2,2',7,7'-tetrakis(diphenylamino)-9,9'-spirobifluorene are disclosed as suitable for the hole

Art Unit: 1786

transport layer. The reference also discloses metal oxides such as ruthenium oxide and molybdenum oxide as able to facilitate hole injection from the anode with high hole mobility ([0211]-[0212]). A layer of metal oxide on the anode is disclosed to lower initial driving voltage, suppress the voltage elevation on continuous driving, and improve adhesion [0211]. However the reference does not explicitly disclose a carbazole compound with a transition metal oxide in the hole transporting layer.

Seo et al. teach a similar organic electroluminescent device (abstract). The reference teaches combining the hole injection and transport layers into a single mixed layer [0033]. By combining the layers the reference teaches an energy barrier can be reduced lowering drive voltage and increasing service life of the device ([0032]-[0034]).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the hole transport and injection layers, as taught by of Seo et al., in the device of Sato et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect such a layer to be suitable given that Seo et al. and Sato et al. both teach similar phosphorescent organic electroluminescent devices. Additionally Sato et al. teach that material used for the hole transporting layer needs a small ionization potential, high hole mobility, and excellent stability [0172], which are properties Sato et al. discloses metal oxides to have ([0211]-[0212]). Ruthenium oxide and molybdenum oxide are also disclosed to efficiently inject holes from the anode and transport the holes to subsequent layers, which is disclosed as the function of the hole transport layer [0172]. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that *adding* oxides of ruthenium or molybdenum to the hole transport layer would not destroy the function of the layer given that Sato et al. clearly discloses

Art Unit: 1786

the metal oxides to possess properties desirable for the hole transport layer. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by a desire to improve adhesion (Sato et al. [0211]), lower the drive voltage, suppress the voltage elevation on continuous driving, and increase the service life of the device.

Shirota et al. teach carbazole compounds of instant general formula (4) as suitable compounds for the hole transport layer (column 4, lines 38-41, compound 3) used in a organic electroluminescent device (abstract). The reference teaches the compound to have high heat resistance capable enable high luminance with a high efficiency for a long time (column 1, lines 57-60).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the carbazole compounds of Shirota et al. with the device of modified Sato et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect the compounds of Shirota et al. to be suitable in the hole transport layer of modified Sato et al. given that the compound is taught as suitable for the hole transport layer of a similar electroluminescent device by Shirota et al. (column 4, lines 38-65). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by a desire to have high heat resistance capable enable high luminance with a high efficiency for a long time (column 1, lines 57-60).

Regarding claims 25 and 26, Sato et al. disclose all the claim limitations as set forth above. Additionally the reference discloses a means for controlling light emission of the light-emitting element given that the voltage needed to obtain a specific luminance is reported (table 3, page 46). Also the reference discloses an electronic appliance with a display portion comprised of a light emitting element [0261].

Double Patenting

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-42 and 50 of copending Application No. 10/571,891 in view of Shiratsuchi et al. (US 6,084,176).

While the claims are not identical there is significant overlap in the claims. Application No. 10/571,891 teaches a light-emitting element comprising a light emitting layer and a mixed layer of molybdenum oxide and an aromatic amine compound between a pair of electrodes (copending claim 30). The mixed layer is adjacent to the anode (copending claim 35). The copending application also teaches an electronic

Art Unit: 1786

appliance comprising the light-emitting element, such as a person computer, a television, or a navigation system (copending claim 50). These appliances necessarily comprise a display portion and a means for controlling light emission of the light-emitting element. However the copending application does not explicitly teach a carbazole compound as the arylamine compound.

Shiratsuchi et al. teach carbazole compounds of instant general formulae (1), (2) with Ar of instant formula 2-1 (compound H-23, column 23), and (3) (compound H-38 column 29) with instant Ar 3-1 (compounds H-24, column 23) and as suitable compounds for the hole transport layer (column 13, line 12 to column 14, line 5) used in a photoelectric device (column 2, lines 12-16). The reference also teaches the carbazole compounds as equivalent and interchangeable with the hole transporting arylamine compounds of copending application (column 13, line 12 to column 14, line 5).

In view of Shiratsuchi et al.'s recognition that the carbazole compounds and the hole transporting compounds of copending application are equivalent and interchangeable, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the arylamine compounds of copending application with carbazole compounds such as H-23, H-24, or H-38 taught by Shiratsuchi et al. and thereby arrive at the present invention. Case law holds that the mere substitution of an equivalent (something equal in value or meaning, as taught by analogous prior art) is not an act of invention; where equivalency is known to the prior art, the substitution of

Art Unit: 1786

one equivalent for another is not patentable. See *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Applicants' attention is drawn to MPEP 804 where it is disclosed that "the specification can always be used as a dictionary to learn the meaning of a term in a patent claim." *In re Boylan*, 392 F.2d 1017, 157 USPQ 370 (CCPA 1968). Further, those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in an application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. (underlining added by examiner for emphasis) *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619,622 (CCPA 1970). Consistent with the above underlined portion of the MPEP citation, attention is drawn to paragraphs [0058]-[0061] which clearly teach one of ordinary skill in the art to use a ratio of 0.245:1(oxide: NPD) and a thickness of 130 nm for the mixed layer.

Therefore, given the overlap between the present claims and the copending claims, it would have been within the skill level of, as well as obvious to, one of ordinary skill in the art to use the device which is both disclosed by copending Application No. 10/571,891 and encompassed by the scope of the present claims in view of Shiratsuchi et al. (US 6,084,176) and thereby arrive at the present invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Art Unit: 1786

13. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-29 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 30-42 and 50 of commonly assigned Application No. 10/571,891. Specifically, see above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned Application No. 10/571,891, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

14. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 25-29 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over copending Application No. 10/571,891 which has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under

Art Unit: 1786

35 U.S.C. 102(e) if published or patented. This provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is based upon a presumption of future publication or patenting of the conflicting application. Specifically, see above.

This provisional rejection might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by a showing of a date of invention for the instant application prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the copending application under 37 CFR 1.131. This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the copending application is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

15. Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, and 25-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-42 and 50 of copending Application No. 10/571,891 in view of Shirota et al. (US 5,487,953).

While the claims are not identical there is significant overlap in the claims. Application No. 10/571,891 teaches a light-emitting element comprising a light emitting layer and a mixed layer of molybdenum oxide and an aromatic amine compound between a pair of electrodes (copending claim 30). The mixed layer is adjacent to the anode (copending claim 35). The copending application also teaches an electronic appliance comprising the light-emitting element, such as a person computer, a

Art Unit: 1786

television, or a navigation system (copending claim 50). These appliances necessarily comprise a display portion and a means for controlling light emission of the light-emitting element. However the copending application does not explicitly teach a carbazole compound as the arylamine compound.

Shirota et al. teach carbazole compounds of instant general formula (4) as suitable compounds for the hole transport layer (column 4, lines 38-41, compound 3) used in a organic electroluminescent device (abstract). The reference teaches the compound to have high heat resistance capable enable high luminance with a high efficiency for a long time (column 1, lines 57-60).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the carbazole compounds of Shirota et al. with the device of copending application. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect the compounds of Shirota et al. to be suitable in the mixed layer of copending application given that the compound is taught as suitable for transporting holes in similar electroluminescent devices by Shirota et al. (column 4, lines 38-65). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by a desire to have high heat resistance capable enable high luminance with a high efficiency for a long time (column 1, lines 57-60).

Applicants' attention is drawn to MPEP 804 where it is disclosed that "the specification can always be used as a dictionary to learn the meaning of a term in a patent claim." *In re Boylan*, 392 F.2d 1017, 157 USPQ 370 (CCPA 1968). Further, those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in an

Art Unit: 1786

application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent.

(underlining added by examiner for emphasis) *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438,164 USPQ 619,622 (CCPA 1970). Consistent with the above underlined portion of the MPEP citation, attention is drawn to paragraphs [0058]-[0061] which clearly teach one of ordinary skill in the art to use a ratio of 0.245:1(oxide: NPD) and a thickness of 130 nm for the mixed layer.

Therefore, given the overlap between the present claims and the copending claims, it would have been within the skill level of, as well as obvious to, one of ordinary skill in the art to use the device which is both disclosed by copending Application No. 10/571,891 and encompassed by the scope of the present claims in view of Shirota et al. (US 5,487,953) and thereby arrive at the present invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

16. Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, and 25-29 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 30-42 and 50 of commonly assigned Application No. 10/571,891. Specifically, see above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned Application No. 10/571,891., discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this

Art Unit: 1786

application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

17. Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 19-21, and 25-29 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over copending Application No. 10/571,891 which has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) if published or patented. This provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is based upon a presumption of future publication or patenting of the conflicting application. Specifically, see above.

This provisional rejection might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by a showing of a date of invention for the instant application prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the copending application under 37 CFR 1.131. This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the copending application is disqualified under 35 U.S.C.

Art Unit: 1786

103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed 14 April 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Sato et al. does not disclose a composite material comprising an organic compound and a metal oxide. Sato et al. merely discloses a structure where a hole transporting layer is over a hole injection layer. However as explained above Sato et al. (US 2003/0218418 A9) teaches that ruthenium oxide and molybdenum oxide as hole injection material and that they possess a small ionization potential, high hole mobility, and excellent stability which are properties Sato et al. discloses are properties of a hole transporting material. Seo et al. (US 2002/0086180 A1) teaches to mix the hole injection and transport layers into a single layer teaching the single mixed layer retains the function of the two separate layers and further gives one of ordinary skill in the art motivation to mix the layers by teaching the mixed layer reduces energy barriers lowering drive voltage and increasing service life of the device.

Additionally Applicants argue that the present invention discloses a composite material formed of an organic compound and an inorganic compound. In the case of using a composite material formed of CBP as an organic compound (aryl carbazole) and molybdenum oxide as an inorganic compound (metal oxide), Applicants explain, the data shows that the composite material is a different material from CBP because the

Art Unit: 1786

absorption spectrum of the composite material of the present invention has a different spectrum from the spectrum of CBP (please see, paragraph [0142] and the range of visible light in Figure 12). Sato et al., Applicants argue, does not teach or suggest that a composite material formed of an organic material and an inorganic material is a different material from the organic material. However the prior art teaches carbazole compounds as hole transporting material, metal oxides as hole injection material and teaches combining the two materials into a single layer. The material resulting from following the teachings of the prior art would inherently possess the properties cited by applicants. Applicants have not demonstrated any difference between combining the prior art material as suggested by the prior art and the presently claimed material. For example mixing the CBP and molybdenum oxide of the prior art will inherently produce the same material as mixing applicants CBP and molybdenum oxide. Additionally the fact that applicants may have found another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Further Applicants assert that if one were to simply combine the metal oxides of Sato et al. into a hole transport layer, then the changes to the organic material and the inorganic material would be highly unpredictable; therefore, it would be difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to necessarily expect to achieve the above-referenced effects of the present invention. However Seo et al. clearly gives one of ordinary skill in the art reason to reasonably expect that combining

Art Unit: 1786

the hole injection and hole transport layers of Sato et al. will produce a single suitable layer. Especially in light of the fact that Sato et al. teaches the metal oxides to possess the properties of a hole transport material. Seo et al. specifically teaches combined hole injection/transport layers to retain the function of the individual layers and give further advantages over the use of separate layers.

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **MICHAEL WILSON** whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 1786

270-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30-5:00PM EST, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Tarazano can be reached on (571) 272-1515. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. Lawrence Tarazano/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1786

MHW